



MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTES

JUNE 29 2004

4:00 P.M.

ROOM 113

Task Force Members Present	Kit Boesch, Nye Bond, Duane Eitel, Margaret Hall, Elaine Hammer, Rick Krueger, Greg MacLean, Marian Malone, Bill McCoy, Gordon Scholz, Terry Werner. (Susan Dunn, Tad McDowell, Eric Miller, Patte Newman, Oscar Pohirieth, absent)
Resource Panel Members Present	Mike Brienzo, Terry Genrich, Randy Hoskins, Sandy Strickland, Larry Worth,
Others Present	Alvin Lugn, Brian Praeuner, Richard Schmeling, Alan Wickman, Kent Morgan, David Cary, Michele Abendroth

Agenda Topics

1. Call Meeting to Order

Mr. Morgan called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2. Public Comment Period (10 min. maximum)

Alan Wickman presented a memorandum stating that he believes the reference to the money expenditures for bike lanes should be removed as we do not know how much money is needed. Instead, he believes it should be incorporated into the multi-modal transportation coordinator position. He also noted an error in the reference stating that bicyclists must dismount and walk across intersections, which is not correct. There is also an error in the statement that the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee has expressed an interest in undertaking a review of the City's pedestrian and bicycles statutes, as they have not expressed this interest. He also believes that the statement, "some existing bicycle routes may be evaluated for opportunities to provide bike lanes for the same reasons they were originally chosen to be on-street bike routes" should be removed. The last suggestion he made is to edit the reference that bike lanes will be recommended for the downtown area, as he feels there are ways other than bike lanes to make streets bicycle-friendly.

Alvin Lugn remarked that he is inclined to believe that all relevant factors have not been considered by the Task Force, although he does not believe this invalidates the things

accomplished by the Task Force. When asked what he believes is missing, he stated that he believes the Task Force is treading on muddy ground when it crosses the threshold into considering reduced service in any area. He added that this should be studied further.

3. StarTran Service Design Proposal

Mr. Morgan reviewed the implications created by the reduced StarTran service area. Approximately 606 patrons will lose current transit service. Costs were identified for the additional services.

Mr. Krueger asked if it is required to provide service to all geographical areas. Mr. Worth replied that it is not. Ms. Malone stated that she believes the service area should not be reduced. She believes it is best to leave StarTran as is, with the hope that when the economy gets better, StarTran can then be improved.

Ms. Boesch then presented a proposal regarding low income fares. The proposal states that for six months, low income people can purchase a bus pass for \$5 per month for unlimited rides anywhere in the city. She has a \$55,000 city funded low income transportation program, where agencies can purchase low income passes from StarTran. There are three entities who currently buy low income passports for their clients. The problem is that they run out of these passes too fast. Her proposal states that any low income person can buy a \$5 pass. They would expand the number of places to purchase passes. She would return \$50,000 to StarTran and keep \$5,000 for people who have no income and to supervise this pilot project. In 6 months, she believes ridership would increase. It would also identify the costs for StarTran as well as how much money it would bring in.

Ms. Malone stated that she feels this is a good proposal. She then made a motion to approve this proposal, seconded by Mr. Bond. Motion carried 10-0. Boesch, Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Krueger, Malone, McCoy, Scholz, and Werner voting 'yes'; Dunn, MacLean, McDowell, Miller, Newman, Pohirieth absent.

4. MMT Subarea Plan: Proposed Text

Mr. Morgan explained that there were some comments made after the last Task Force meeting that instead of committing to using College View as the pilot area for a multi-modal transportation subarea plan, perhaps we should see what the interest is across the Lincoln community and include College View in that mix. He stated that text has been drafted to indicate such. Mr. Bond moved approval of the proposed text, seconded by Mr. McCoy. Motion carried 7-3. Boesch, Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, McCoy and Scholz voting 'yes'; Krueger, Malone and Werner voting 'no'; Dunn, MacLean, McDowell, Miller, Newman, and Pohirieth absent.

5. Review Draft: Vision Statements

Mr. Morgan explained that there are two pages of vision statements, one being broad and one encompassing each of the four activity areas. Mr. Werner made a motion to approve both vision statement documents, seconded by Mr. McCoy. Motion carried 10-0. Boesch, Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Krueger, Malone, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting 'yes'; Dunn, MacLean, McDowell, Miller, Newman, Pohirieth absent.

6. Review Draft: Multi-Modal Center

Mr. Morgan stated that there is a proposal for a multi-modal center to be constructed where StarTran fixed route services could be centralized, as well as support other multi-modal activities. Mr. Krueger stated that he has a little apprehension because once you put in a fixed hub, everything starts gravitating around it. He suspects the center would be downtown and he doesn't know if that is the best place for it. Mr. Morgan stated that the route structure would have to be looked at before doing this, and it has to be an integral part of what StarTran is doing. Ms. Malone stated that she doesn't believe this is a good step at this time.

Mr. Scholz questioned the priorities of the suggestions being proposed. Mr. Morgan replied that it is the decision of the Task Force if there is a priority list.

Mr. Werner stated that he does not know if the hub should be located downtown and suggested removing the first paragraph under the section Activity Resource Needs on page 5, which reads, "The Downtown Master Plan study offers the opportunity to look at possible sites for a multi-modal center if it is located in the Downtown. This information will be useful as background information for the technical study that is needed prior to the construction of the multi-modal center." Mr. McCoy moved to approve this chapter with the amendment, seconded by Ms. Boesch. Motion carried 9-1. Boesch, Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Malone, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting 'yes'; Krueger voting 'no'; Dunn, MacLean, McDowell, Miller, Newman, Pohirieth absent.

7. Review Draft: Integrated Ped/Bike System

Mr. Krueger began the discussion by noting that sidewalk requirements are waived when Community Unit Plans are involved. He made a motion to amend the text under the heading *Sidewalks Required on Both Sides of Street* on page 4, as follows, "This requirement should continue to be enforced, and attempts to waver *except under Community Unit Plans* should be avoided."; it was seconded by Mr. Eitel.

Ms. Hammer questioned the order of the list of streets identified for grade separations on page 6 under the heading *Need for Additional Path Rehabilitation and Maintenance Funding*. She moved to add the text, *not in any particular order of importance*, prior to the list of projects; it was seconded by Ms. Boesch. She also cautioned that we have to be careful not to use the word *maintenance* when referring to trails and a bond issue; instead *rehabilitation* should be used. Mr. Morgan stated that he agrees and an editorial change will be made. She also does not like having two different departments administering this system. She then made a motion that this system be administered under one entity, seconded by Mr. Krueger. In reference to Mr. Wickman's comment about bike lanes, she feels that this text should not be taken out.

Ms. Hammer made a motion to approve this chapter with the three amendments as mentioned above; it was seconded by Mr. McCoy. Motion carried 10-0. Boesch, Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Krueger, Malone, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting 'yes'; Dunn, MacLean, McDowell, Miller, Newman, Pohirieth absent.

8. Review Draft: Multi-Modal Oriented Design

Mr. Krueger questioned the use of the word reciprocal in the second paragraph on page 3, as follows: “No single mode is given preference, but rather are viewed as reciprocal.” Mr. Morgan replied that they are looking at this as an integrated system and that each system helps the other system.

Also on page 3, under the bullet point, *Make connections*, Mr. Krueger questioned the sentence, “This requires paying close attention to how people can get around by foot, bicycle, transit, and car -- usually in that order.” He would like to strike “usually in that order.”

He also questioned the recommendation that sidewalks go from 10 to 15 foot in width, which is a lot of land area. He would like to reword this recommendation to indicate that sidewalk width be appropriate to scale.

On page 8, he would like to remove the bullet point “Priority of Access - Efforts should be made to give priority access first to pedestrians and bicycles, followed by buses, and then cars and trucks.” He remarked that this is not how we are living, and he doesn’t believe we are going to move toward that in the next 50 years. Mr. Morgan responded that it is a matter of balance, and clearly the automobile dominates in terms of the way we design subdivisions and commercial areas. Mr. Werner suggested changing this sentence to reflect that it is a matter of balance.

Mr. Eitel commented on the bullet point on page 6, as follows: “Multiple Routes to Core Uses and Transit Services - Street systems within residential subdivisions should be coherent, recognizable, and interconnected. Streets should provide direct and understandable access for all modes -- pedestrian, bike, and automobile.” He suggested removing “pedestrian, bike, and automobile”, so as not to limit ourselves.

Mr. Krueger made a motion to approve this chapter with the amendments mentioned above; it was seconded by Mr. Scholz. Motion carried 9-0. Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Krueger, MacLean, Malone, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting ‘yes’; Boesch and Bond abstaining; Dunn, McDowell, Miller, Newman, and Pohirieth absent.

9. Review Draft: Management and Funding

Mr. Krueger stated that his research indicates that over the past 11 years, fare recovery has been between 16.7%-21.8%. Last year, it was approximately 18%. He made a motion to achieve a 30% fare recovery, seconded by Mr. Werner. Mr. Worth stated that the national average for fare recovery is 18%-20% for cities our size. After further consideration, Mr. Krueger made an amendment to his motion to have a goal of 25% fare recovery.

Ms. Boesch asked if the pros and cons of each of the recommendations could be identified in the report. She is frustrated by the fact that another study is recommended. She would like to see a decision made and implemented in a reasonable time frame. Ms. Boesch then made a motion that the report indicate management and funding options are a critical and pivotal point in moving any of these recommendations forward, and this task should be completed in 12 months. Motion carried 11-0. Boesch, Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Krueger, MacLean, Malone, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting ‘yes’; Dunn, McDowell, Miller, Newman and Pohirieth absent.

The Task Force then voted on Mr. Krueger's amendment regarding the 25% fare recovery. Motion carried 9-1. Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Krueger, MacLean, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting 'yes'; Malone voting 'no'; Boesch, Dunn, McDowell, Miller, Newman and Pohirieth absent.

Ms. Hammer moved approval of the chapter, seconded by Mr. Scholz. Motion carried 10-0. Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Krueger, MacLean, Malone, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting 'yes'; Boesch, Dunn, McDowell, Miller, Newman and Pohirieth absent.

10. Review Draft: Marketing and Finance

Mr. Scholz moved approval of this chapter, seconded by Mr. McCoy. Motion carried 9-1. Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, Krueger, MacLean, Malone, McCoy and Scholz voting 'yes'; Werner voting 'no'; Boesch, Dunn, McDowell, Miller, Newman and Pohirieth absent. **Note:** Mr. Werner originally voted 'yes', and then later changed his vote to 'no' because he believes there should be a reference to creating and setting benchmarks with the marketing plan.

11. Review Draft: Pedestrian Standards

Mr. Krueger noted that we have sufficient standards in place already. Mr. Morgan stated that we do have standards, but they are minimal. They want to take a look at things that can bolster pedestrians as part of the overall transportation system. Mr. Krueger stated that he believes a lot of this is redundant. He then asked about the reference to five foot sidewalk widths. Mr. Morgan noted that the report states, "sidewalks along arterials should be built to a minimum of six feet and along residential streets to a minimum of five feet."

Mr. Krueger questioned the sentence stating, "As future streets are planned or corridor improvements designed, consideration should be given to the selective deployment of traffic calming features." Mr. Eitel stated that he believes the corridor improvements reference should be taken out, because it could be interpreted in different ways that what is actually intended.

Mr. Eitel questioned why there is the six foot width on arterials and five foot along residential streets. Mr. MacLean suggested that it be changed to state that sidewalks should be built to five feet or wider where required for safety reasons.

Mr. Krueger reiterated the fact that where we have problems with connections, we need to order the districts to get these things done.

Mr. Scholz moved approval of the report, seconded by Ms. Malone. Motion carried 8-1. Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, MacLean, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting 'yes'; Krueger voting 'no'; Boesch, Dunn, Malone, McDowell, Miller, Newman and Pohirieth absent.

12. Review Draft: Intra- and Inter-City Services

Mr. Eitel distributed a handout regarding mass transit issues. Ms. Hammer made a motion to approve the report, seconded by Mr. Krueger. Motion carried 7-0. Eitel, Hammer, Krueger, MacLean, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting 'yes'; Bond abstaining; Boesch, Dunn, Hall, Malone, McDowell, Miller, Newman, Pohirieth absent.

13. Review Draft: Planning, Education and Services

Mr. McCoy moved approval of the report, seconded by Mr. Scholz. Motion carried 8-0; Bond, Eitel, Hall, Hammer, MacLean, McCoy, Scholz and Werner voting 'yes'; Krueger abstaining; Boesch, Dunn, Malone, McDowell, Miller, Newman and Pohirieth absent.

14. Other Items

Mr. Morgan stated that they will make the appropriate changes to the report and give it to the Mayor and City Council for their review. He also informed the Task Force of the upcoming Downtown Master Plan process which begins June 30th.

Mr. Morgan then thanked the Task Force for their hard work in this process.

15. Adjourn

Mr. Morgan adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

I:\Multi-modal trans\Minutes\Meeting Notes 06 29 04.wpd